

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-14 were pending. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-14 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent claims. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,594,472 to Curtis et al. ("Curtis") and claims 5-7 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis in view of U.S. Patent No. to Tomura et al. ("Tomura"). To the extent these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 of the present application recites a protection structure for use with an electronic device in which a first protection element and a second protection element in combination substantially completely accommodate and protect an electronic module. This added feature is also incorporated into amended claim 8.

As defined by amended claims 1 and 8, one of the features of the present invention is a protection structure for use with an electronic device having an electronic module. The protection structure includes a first and a second protection element for substantially completely accommodating and protecting said electronic module. In other words, other than the first and the second protection element, there is no need for any additional protective means to facilitate

the protection of the electronic module.

In contrast, Curtis discloses a protection structure for use with a communication device, but the combination of a first protection element (the front cover 2) and a second protection element (the rear cover 3) does not completely protect the electronic module inside. That is, Curtis needs additional portions to complete the protection of the electronic module. To do so, Curtis includes wall section 27 or grip area 27 that are disposed on two sides of the electronic module. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Curtis fails to teach or suggest a protection structure including a first and a second protection element in combination that substantially completely accommodate and protect the electronic module, as recited in amended claims 1 and 8. Thus, claims 1 and 8 should be patentable over Curtis.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claims 3 and 10, lies in that the second protection element is formed with an opening, and the electronic device connects with an electrical power supply device through the opening. The opening of the second protection element allows convenient electrical connections between the electronic device and the electrical power supply without sacrificing the protective function provided by the second protection element.

In contrast, Curtis discloses a lower cover 12 having a recess 22 to accommodate a battery 23. Curtis, however, does not disclose any protective devices that allow electrical connection between the electronic device and the power supply. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 10 are also patentable over Curtis.

Based on the same reasons stated above, claims 2, 4, 8-9, and 11 are also believed to be

patentable over Curtis at least due to their dependencies from patentable independent claims 1 and 8.

Regarding the rejection of dependent claims 5-7 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that another feature of the present invention is that the protection structure includes a first and a second protection element to accommodate the electronic module completely, and the first and the second protection elements are made of metal materials, for providing the electronic device with a shielding function. Here, the so-called shielding function comprises providing protection against not only impact from outside, but also electro-magnetic interference.

Tomura fails to teach or suggest these features as recited in claims 5-7 and 12-14. Specifically, Tomura teaches an electromagnetic shielding structure for high-frequency circuit arrangements. The shielding structure includes a mounting member, a printed circuit board, a molded plastic, a plurality of ribs, and a shielding member (see e.g., claim 1 of Tomura.) Thus, the aluminum die casting arrangement disclosed in Tomura (see Col. 1, lines 45-50) cannot provide protection against impact from outside. As described above, Curtis fails to teach or suggest any protection structure including a first and a second protection element in combination that substantially completely accommodate and protect the electronic module, nor any protective devices that allow an electrical connection between the electronic device and the power supply. Therefore, it would not have been obvious for those skilled in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device of Curtis with the protection structure of Tomura to achieve the

Serial No.: 10/620,558
Art Unit: 2835

Attorney's Docket No.: LEE0013-US
Page 8

shielding purpose. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-7 and 12-14 are patentable over Curtis in view of Tomura.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Respectfully submitted,

LONG-JYH PAN ET AL.

By: 

Michael Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

Date: May 17, 2005

MDB/LDE/CYM/dkp

Customer No. 28970

Document #: 1323434 v.1